

### REMARKS

The Non-Final Office Action mailed September 20, 2007 considered claims 1-27, 35-42 and 44-71. Claims 1-20, 22-27, 35-40, 42, 44-50, 52, 54-62, and 64-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Maruyama et al. (US 6,990,585) hereinafter *Maruyama*.<sup>1</sup>

Claims 70 and 71 were allowed. Claims 21, 41, 51, 53, and 63 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

By this paper, claims 1, 23, 37, 44, 56, 58, 65, and 68 have been amended, claims 21, 24, 35, 36, 38, 41, 43, 51, 57, 63, and 69 have been cancelled, such that claims 1-20, 22, 23, 25-27, 37, 39, 40, 42, 44-50, 52-56, 58-62, 64-68, 70 and 71 remain pending in the application, of which, only claims 1, 23, 37, 44, 56, 58, 65, 68, and 70 are the only independent claims.

As communicated in my communications to the Examiner on December 6, 2007 and again on December 12, 2007, claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of allowable claim 21. Claim 23 is a computer program product claim reciting limitations similar to claim 1, has been amended to include the subject matter of allowable claim 21 and should therefore be in condition for allowance. Claim 37 has been amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 41. Claim 44 has been amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 51. Claim 56 is a computer program product claim with limitations similar to claim 44, has been amended to include the subject matter of allowable claim 53, which depends from claim 44, and as such should be in condition for allowance. Claim 58 has been amended to include the subject matter of allowable claim 63. Claim 65 is an analog to claim 58 in that claim 58 recites limitations from the perspective of a sending computer system while claim 65 recites limitations from the perspective of a receiving computer system. Claim 65 has been amended to include the limitations from allowable claim 63. Claim 68, while not including an allowed dependent claim, has been amended with the subject matter of a number of the allowable claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the

---


<sup>1</sup> Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at 801-533-9800.

Dated this 20<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER  
Registration No. 28,651  
J. LAVAR OLDHAM  
Registration No. 53,409  
Attorneys for Applicant  
Customer No. 47973